



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/612,689	07/02/2003	Vincenzo Salluzzo	2225002	4414

7590 02/22/2008
VINCENZO SALLUZZO
21 Phillips St.
Amsterdam, NY 12010

EXAMINER

HAYLES, ASHFORD S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3627

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

02/22/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/612,689	Applicant(s) SALLUZZO, VINCENZO	
	Examiner Ashford S. Hayles	Art Unit 4127	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 January 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-39 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 19-21,25-28,30,31 and 37 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18,22-24,29,32-36,38 and 39 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 02 July 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>07/28/2003</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election without traverse of Group I (claims 1-18, 22-24, 29, 32-36, 38 and 39) in the reply filed on January 15, 2008 is acknowledged.
2. Claims 19-21, 25-28, 30, 31 and 37 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 16 and 32-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

4. Claim 16 contains the trademark/trade name YELLOW PAGES. Where a trademark or trade name is used in a claim as a limitation to identify or describe a particular material or product, the claim does not comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. See *Ex parte Simpson*, 218 USPQ 1020 (Bd. App. 1982). The claim scope is uncertain since the trademark or trade name cannot be used properly to identify any particular material or product. A trademark or trade name is used to identify a source of goods, and not the goods themselves. Thus, a trademark or trade name does not identify or describe the goods associated with the trademark or trade name. In the present case, the trademark/trade name is used to

identify/describe phone book directory and, accordingly, the identification/description is indefinite.

5. Claim 32 recites the limitation "handheld devices" in lines 21 and 27. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

- 7. Claims 1-5, 10,11,14-18, 22-24, 29, and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Burch et al. (#6,826,473) further in view of Ratschunas (#6,958,692).**

As per Claim 1, 29, and 38 Burch et al. discloses a computerized method, system and program storage device readable by a machine tangibly embodying at least one program of instructions executable by the machine to perform a method for determining expenses related to travel (Column 3, line 67 to Column 4, lines 1-3), the method comprising:

tracking a physical location of a user in real time (Column 11, lines 29-31, where the prior art also discloses an electronic navigation device employing a GPS receiver has the ability to accurately compute the position of the device in real time); and
automatically assigning expenses based on the tracking of the physical location of the user to the plurality of different locations (Figure 12, Steps 1210-1241).

However fails to disclose storing a plurality of appointments at a plurality of different locations.

Both Ratschunas and Burch et al. are within the same field business travel. Ratschunas teaches a memory for storing a plurality of appointment entries, each appointment entry including data specifying a time and a place (Abstract).

Therefore, from this teaching of Ratschunas, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the PDA with integrated navigation functions and expense reporting of Burch et al. to include the ability to store a plurality of appointments with corresponding locations of Ratschunas. The motivation to combine would have been to keep track of meetings and expenses along with their locations.

As per Claim 2, Burch et al. discloses a computerized method wherein the automatically assigning expense (Figure 12, Steps 1210-1241). However fails to disclose comparing the location of the user to the plurality of different locations.

Both Ratschunas and Burch et al. are within the same field business travel. Ratschunas teaches when a user makes a journey from one location to another the phone can, knowing the locations of "Home" and "Work" from the database can tell when the user has left home and arrived at work (Column 5, lines 34-38).

Therefore, from this teaching of Ratschunas, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the PDA with integrated navigation functions and expense reporting of Burch et al. to include the

ability to compare plurality of locations with a location of Ratschunas. The motivation to combine would have been to determine distances between various locations.

As per Claim 3, Burch et al. discloses a computerized method wherein the automatically assigning expenses comprises determining a number of miles (Figure 5, Distance Data 544) traveled by the user between the plurality of different locations (Column 10, lines 50-54).

As per Claim 4, Burch et al. discloses a computerized method further comprising displaying the expenses associated with the plurality of appointments (Figure 14 and 15, which both depict Attendees 1520, indicating the occurrence of a meeting).

However fails to disclose displaying the plurality of appointments.

Both Ratschunas and Burch et al. are within the same field of business travel. Ratschunas teaches a mobile phone has a diary/calendar function. The table (Column 4, lines 25-35) illustrates some possible entries in the diary.

Therefore, from this teaching of Ratschunas, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the PDA with integrated navigation functions and expense reporting of Burch et al. to include the ability to display a plurality of appointments with corresponding locations of Ratschunas.

The motivation to combine would have been to display meetings along with their locations.

As per Claim 5, Burch et al. discloses a computerized method further comprising generating a report of expenses associated with the plurality of appointments (Column 11, lines 35-40).

However fails to disclose the plurality of appointments.

Both Ratschunas and Burch et al. are within the same field business travel. Ratschunas teaches a memory for storing a plurality of appointment entries, each appointment entry including data specifying a time and a place (Abstract).

Therefore, from this teaching of Ratschunas, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the PDA with integrated navigation functions and expense reporting of Burch et al. to include the ability to store a plurality of appointments with corresponding locations of Ratschunas.

The motivation to combine would have been to set meetings along with their locations.

As per Claim 10, Burch et al. discloses a computerized method of claim 1 further comprising manually assigning expenses (Column 15, lines 17-19).

However fails disclose a plurality of appointments.

Both Ratschunas and Burch et al. are within the same field of business travel. Ratschunas teaches a memory for storing a plurality of appointment entries, each appointment entry including data specifying a time and a place (Abstract).

Therefore, from this teaching of Ratschunas, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the PDA with integrated navigation functions and expense reporting of Burch et al. to include the ability to store a plurality of appointments with corresponding locations of Ratschunas.

The motivation to combine would have been to set meetings along with their expenses.

As per Claim 11, Burch et al. discloses a computerized method further comprising storing a plurality of contact profiles (Figure 6, PDA Address Book Data 638) comprising at least a name (Figure 6, Name 652) and a location (Figure 6, Location 660) of the contact and automatically assigning the location of the appointment as the location of the contact (Column 11, line 17-19).

As per Claim 13, Burch et al. discloses a computerized method further comprising storing at least one note (Figure 15, Note 1532) and document relating to the appointment (Figure 15, Note 1532).

As per Claim 14, Burch et al. discloses all elements of the claimed invention. However, fails to disclose a computerized method further comprising notifying the user of a message.

Both Ratschunas and Burch et al. are within the same field of business travel. Ratschunas teaches an alert could take the form of displaying of a message (Column 2, lines 61-63).

Therefore, from this teaching of Ratschunas, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the PDA with integrated navigation functions and expense reporting of Burch et al. to include the ability to store a plurality of appointments with corresponding locations of Ratschunas.

The motivation to combine would have been to set an audible alert to inform the user of upcoming events.

As per Claim 15, Burch et al. discloses a computerized method further comprising providing information to the user based on the physical location of the user (Column 11, line 30).

As per Claim 16, Burch et al. discloses all elements of the claimed invention.

However, Burch et al. fails to disclose a computerized method further comprising automatically scheduling a plurality of appointments based on a yellow pages directory category.

Both Ratschunas and Burch et al. are within the same field of business travel. Ratschunas teaches entering the name of a place the user can enter the name directly or choose from a list of names in the place database (Column 6, lines 15-17), where the entries within the diary/calendar of Ratschunas are appointments (Column 4, lines 25-35).

Therefore, from this teaching of Ratschunas, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the PDA with integrated navigation functions and expense reporting of Burch et al. to include the ability to set meeting places using the function of a diary/calendar of Ratschunas.

The motivation to combine would have been to set meetings based on phone book entries.

As per Claim 17, Burch et al. discloses a computerized method wherein the storing, the tracking, and the automatically assigning expenses is performed on a portable device (Figure 1A-1C).

As per Claim 18, Burch et al. discloses a computerized method wherein the storing, the tracking, and the automatically assigning expenses is performed on at least one of a handheld device, a laptop computer, and a cell phone (Column 6, lines 57-59).

As per Claim 22, Burch et al. discloses a portable electronic device for determining expenses related to travel for a user (Figure 1A-1C), the device comprising:

a processor (Figure 2, Processor 236);

a position locating device (Figure 2, GPS Receiver 238 and Antenna 214), a memory (Figure 2, Memory 242), an input device (Figure 2, Display/Input 226), and a display (Figure 2, Display/Input 226), and a wireless transmitter operably connected to said processor (Figure 2, Cellular Transceiver 258); and

track a physical location of a user in real time based on data from the position locating device (Column 12, line 48-50), automatically assign expenses based on the tracking of the physical location of the user to the plurality of different locations (Figure 12, Steps 1210-1241).

However fails to disclose a processor is operable to store a plurality of appointments at a plurality of different locations.

Both Ratschunas and Burch et al. are within the same field of business travel. Ratschunas teaches a memory for storing a plurality of appointment entries, each appointment entry including data specifying a time and a place (Abstract).

Therefore, from this teaching of Ratschunas, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the PDA with

integrated navigation functions and expense reporting of Burch et al. to include the ability to store a plurality of appointments with corresponding locations of Ratschunas.

The motivation to combine would have been to set meetings along with their locations.

As per Claim 23, Burch et al. discloses a portable electronic device (Figure 1A-1C) wherein said processor is operable to display on said display (Figure 2, Display/Input 226) at least one of the plurality of appointments (Figure 15, Item 1520 which depict Attendees 1520, indicating the occurrence of a meeting) and the expenses (Figure 15, Receipt Details 1510) automatically assigned thereto.

As per Claim 24, Burch et al. discloses a portable electronic device (Figure 1A-1C) wherein said processor is operable to display on said display a report of the expenses (Figure 14 and 15, Items 1410 and 1510).

8. Claims 6-9 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Burch et al. (#6,826,473) in view of Ratschunas (#6,958,692), further in view of Fredericks et al. (PG PUB. 2004/0167808).

As per Claim 6, the Burch et al. and Ratschunas combination discloses all elements of the claimed invention.

However, the Burch et al. and Ratschunas combination fails to disclose a computerized method wherein the automatically assigning expense comprises assigning a cost of an airplane ticket.

Burch et al., Ratschunas and Fredericks et al. are all within the same field of business travel. Fredericks et al. teaches a charge comes in with a description of

"United Airlines." the expense management system can look at past expenses and see that previously when expenses have been submitted and linked to credit card charges with a description of "United Airlines," that expense has been an airfare expense (Paragraph [0053], lines 34-38).

Therefore from this teaching of Fredericks et al., it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Burch et al. and Ratschunas combination to include the ability to assign an airline ticket expense.

The motivation to combine would have been to track all airline travel expenses in order to account for travel expenses.

As per Claim 7, the Burch et al. and Ratschunas combination discloses all elements of the claimed invention.

However, the Burch et al. and Ratschunas combination fails to disclose a computerized method wherein the assigning the cost of an airplane ticket comprises comparing at least the arrival locations to the different locations of the appointments.

Burch et al., Ratschunas and Fredericks et al. are all within the same field of business travel. Fredericks et al. teaches a matching process where, one of the expenses comes from a travel event request and the second comes from a credit card charge or a vendor receipt (Paragraph [0052], lines 8-10), where the travel event request stores the location of travel and the credit card charge is an expense incurred while on a business meeting.

Therefore from this teaching of Fredericks et al., it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Burch et

al. and Ratschunas combination to include the ability to compare the destination of a travel expense to the location of an expense.

The motivation to combine would have been to track airline travel expenses associated with each scheduled meeting.

As per Claim 8, the Burch et al. and Ratschunas combination discloses all elements of the claimed invention.

However, the Burch et al. and Ratschunas combination fails to disclose a computerized method wherein the assigning at least one credit card purchase expense.

Burch et al., Ratschunas and Fredericks et al. are all within the same field of business travel. Fredericks et al. teaches Expense data often comes encoded with a credit card number that has been assigned to a specific person (Paragraph [0044], lines 55-57).

Therefore from this teaching of Fredericks et al., it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Burch et al. and Ratschunas combination to include the ability to assign a credit card purchase to each scheduled meeting.

The motivation to combine would have been to accurately track all credit card expenses for each particular scheduled meeting.

As per Claim 9, the Burch et al. and Ratschunas combination discloses all elements of the claimed invention.

However, Burch et al. and Ratschunas combination fails to disclose a computerized method of wherein the assigning at least one credit card purchase

expense comprises comparing at least one of the locations and the time of the credit card purchase to a time and a location of the plurality of appointments.

Burch et al., Ratschunas and Fredericks et al. are all within the same field of business travel. Fredericks et al. teaches retrieving expense data records reflecting expense transactions; comparing the expense data records to the travel data records; and determining likelihood that the expense data records match the travel data records (Abstract, where the travel data includes travel dates and locations, and expense data includes transactions that have the same vendor and the same rate for the same travel dates).

Therefore from this teaching of Fredericks et al., it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Burch et al. and Ratschunas combination to include the ability to compare time and date location of each transaction with each scheduled meeting.

The motivation to combine would have been to accurately distinguish all travel expenses for a particular scheduled meeting.

As per Claim 12, Burch et al. and Ratschunas combination discloses all elements of the claimed invention.

However, Burch et al. and Ratschunas combination fails to disclose a computerized method wherein the storing further comprises determining a mode of transportation, and wherein the automatically assigning expenses is based on the mode of transportation.

Burch et al., Ratschunas and Fredericks et al. are all within the same field of business travel. Fredericks et al. teaches where each travel event request includes, for example, a travel event type e.g., air, rental car, hotel, limousine, train (Paragraph [0023], lines 15-18), where a on-line self-booking travel tools can enforce travel policies automatically, helping companies control costs (Paragraph [0028], lines 10-12), therefore determining the mode of transportation based on travel policies. Fredericks et al. further teaches expense items are added to the expense report corresponding to any air, car, hotel, train, limousine, parking, taxi, or other items on the travel request for this trip (Paragraph [0047], lines 53-55).

Therefore from this teaching of Fredericks et al., it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Burch et al. and Ratschunas combination to include the determine a mode of transportation and assigning expenses to the mode of transportation for a scheduled meeting.

The motivation to combine would have been to accurately determine the mode of travel and assign expenses accordingly.

9. Claims 32 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Burch et al. (#6,826,473) in view of Ratschunas (#6,958,692), further in view of Crawshaw (PG PUB. 2001/0042032).

As per Claim 32 and 39, the Burch et al. and Ratschunas combinations discloses all elements of the claimed invention.

However fails to disclose a method for providing a service to a business for a plurality of employees, the method comprising:

providing a plurality of handheld devices of claim 22 to the plurality of employees;
providing a central computing unit;
receiving data at the central computing unit regarding physical locations of the plurality of employees and expenses automatically assigned to the plurality of appointments via a communications network from the plurality of handheld devices; and
transferring the data from the central computing unit to a business computer via a communications network.

Burch et al., Ratschunas and Crawshaw are all within the same field of business travel. Crawshaw teaches providing a service to a business for a plurality of employees (Paragraph [0006] discuss a system is provided that enables a user or a plurality of users to enter various data related to the operation of a business), providing a plurality of handheld devices to the plurality of employees (Figure 1A, Computer 80, which can be a personal digital assistant (Paragraph [0037], line 65), depicts a plurality of users);

providing a central computing unit (Figure 1A, Server 10);
receiving data at the central computing unit regarding expenses of a plurality of employees (Figure 1A, Server 10) via a communications network (Figure 1A, Internet 90) from the plurality of handheld devices (Figure 1A, Computer 80); and

transferring the data from the central computing unit to a business computer via a communications network (Paragraph [0043], lines 43-46 discuss data stored in the relational database 44 may be downloaded to the user's computer 80 for use by the off-line program 84, or used by the server 10 when the user accesses the web site).

Therefore from this teaching of Crawshaw et al., it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Burch et al. and Ratschunas combination to include the ability to allow employees to track expenses through a networked environment. The motivation to combine would have been to allow a business to track and store expenses for each individual employee.

As per Claim 33, Burch et al. and Ratschunas combination discloses all elements of the claimed invention.

However the Burch et al. and Ratschunas combination fails to disclose a method further comprising receiving data regarding purchases by the employees.

Burch et al., Ratschunas and Crawshaw are all within the same field of business travel. Crawshaw et al. discloses a method further comprising receiving data regarding purchases by the employees (Paragraph [0047], lines 53-56 discuss an application server 30 receives time and expense data input from a user, where the user is an employee of a business).

Therefore from this teaching of Crawshaw et al., it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Burch et al., and Ratschunas combination to include the ability to allow employees to track expenses through a networked environment. The motivation to combine would have been to allow a business to track and store expenses for each individual employee.

10. Claim 34 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Burch et al. (#6,826,473) in view of Ratschunas (#6,958,692), further in view of Crawshaw (PG PUB. 2001/0042032) in further view of Vance et al. (#7,050,986).

As per Claim 34, Burch et al., Ratschunas and Crawshaw combination discloses all elements of the claimed invention.

However fails to disclose a method further comprising receiving data regarding booked travel arrangements by the employees.

Burch et al., Ratschunas, Crawshaw and Vance et al. are all within the same field of business travel. Vance et al. teaches an entry into the trip request process can be done by either the corporate traveler or by a corporate travel arranger (Column 5, lines 7-9).

Therefore from this teaching of Vance et al., it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Burch et al., Ratschunas and Crawshaw combination to include the ability to allow employees to transmit travel information to a central server. The motivation to combine would have been to allow a business to store all travel information for each individual employee.

11. Claims 35-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Burch et al. (#6,826,473) in view of Ratschunas (#6,958,692), further in view of Crawshaw (PG PUB. 2001/0042032) in further view of Vance et al. (#7,050,986) in further view of Jones et al. (#7,082,400).

As per Claim 35, Burch et al., Ratschunas, Crawshaw, and Vance et al. combination discloses all elements of the claimed invention.

However, Burch et al., Ratschunas, Crawshaw, and Vance et al. combination fails to disclose a method further comprising transferring data to the users regarding changes in a scheduled mode of transportation.

Burch et al., Ratschunas, Crawshaw, Vance et al. and Jones et al. are all within the same field of business travel. Jones et al. teaches when the user is traveling to New York City, renting a car is the least preferred mode of transportation. It is preferable to take public transportation or private transportation given the lack of parking. The user has the option of accepting the recommendation or choosing an alternative (Column 6, lines 47-50).

Therefore from this teaching of Jones et al., it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Burch et al., Ratschunas, Crawshaw and Vance et al. combination to include the ability to notify the user of updates in modes of transportation. The motivation to combine would have been to allow a user to be aware of revisions in modes of traveling.

As per Claim 36, Burch et al., Ratschunas, Crawshaw, and Vance et al. combination discloses all elements of the claimed invention.

However, the Burch et al., Ratschunas, Crawshaw, and Vance et al. combination fails to disclose a method further comprising transferring data to the users regarding alternative modes of transportation.

Burch et al., Ratschunas, Crawshaw, Vance et al. and Jones et al. are all within the same field of business travel. Jones et al. teaches a system determines what ground transportation alternatives are available at the destination airport by referring to travel database 140 (Column 5, lines 26-28).

Therefore from this teaching of Jones et al., it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Burch et al.,

Ratschunas, Crawshaw and Vance et al. combination to include the ability to notify the user of alternate modes of transportation. The motivation to combine would have been to allow a user to be aware of various options of traveling.

Conclusion

12. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Tognazzini (#5,790,974) discloses a portable calendaring device having perceptual agent managing calendar entries.

Finch, II et al. (#6,753,884) discloses a method for wireless we time and expense entry via time keeping and expense tracking server access.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ashford S. Hayles whose telephone number is 571-270-5106. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Thursday 9:00 to 7:30 Eastern Time.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lynda Jasmin can be reached on 571-270-3033. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3627

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Elaine Gort/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3627

2/18/2008

AH